DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 412 840 HE 030 631

AUTHOR	Bailey, Wilford S.
TITLE	Achieving Integrity in Intercollegiate Athletics. AGB Occasional Paper No. 12.
INSTITUTION	Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges, Washington, DC.
SPONS AGENCY	Knight Foundation, Charlotte, NC. Commission on Intercollegiate Athletics.
PUB DATE	1991-00-00
NOTE	31p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges, One Dupont Circle, Suite 400, Washington, DC 20036 (members, $4.95; nonmembers, $9.95; quantity discounts).
PUB TYPE	Opinion Papers (120) -- Reports - Descriptive (141)
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	Accountability; Accrediting Agencies; Administrators; Athletes; Athletic Coaches; Change Agents; Change Strategies; *College Athletics; College Planning; College Presidents; Court Litigation; *Eligibility; Governing Boards; Higher Education; Institutional Mission; *Intercollegiate Cooperation; Mission Statements; *Moral Values; Noninstructional Responsibility; Responsibility; Self Evaluation (Groups); Social Values; Standards; Teacher Responsibility; Television; Trustees; Undergraduate Students; Value Judgment
IDENTIFIERS	Knight Report on Intercollegiate Athletics; *National Collegiate Athletic Association; *Reform Efforts

ABSTRACT

This paper reviews the history of abuse and reform in intercollegiate athletics and the role of governing board members in encouraging reform. It reviews a 1929 report from the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching and the 1991 report of the Knight Foundation Commission, which both note the systemic nature of abuses in college sports, and emphasize the need for higher education to take major corrective action. The paper also discusses the changes instituted by the National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) in the 1980s including more meaningful academic requirements for freshmen, the establishment of the NCAA Presidents Commission, and a revision of NCAA requirements on violations, together with a call by the Executive Director for the development of a new model that would demonstrate the effective control of college sports. Court cases arising out of state law, fans' and alumni charges of bias in NCAA enforcement, and congressional interventions are seen as impediments to solutions, as is faculty reluctance to participate in governance. Trustees are urged to focus on the inculcation of ethical values in all students, and athletes in particular, as the first step in changing societal attitudes about the proper role of intercollegiate athletics in higher education. (BF)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 412 840

Association of Governing Boards
of Universities and Colleges

Achieving Integrity In Intercollegiate Athletics

By Wilford S. Bailey

AGB OCCASIONAL PAPER NO. 12

Made possible by a grant
from The Knight Foundation

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN OTHER THAN PAPER COPY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

AGB

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

AE 030 631

The Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges publishes the Occasional Paper Series as a service to its members. Each paper focuses on current and emerging issues and trends of concern to boards and administrators in the context of their institutional settings and addresses the responsibilities of the institution's leaders and policy makers. AGB distributes new titles in the Occasional Paper Series as they are published to chief executives and board chairs of member institutions.

Permission is granted to AGB members only to photocopy all or part of each paper provided proper credit appears on each copy. Individually bound copies are available at a nominal charge by calling 1-800/356-6317 or 202/296-8400 or by writing to AGB. Multiple-copy discounts are available.

Copyright 1991 Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges, One Dupont Circle, Suite 400, Washington, D.C. 20036. All rights reserved.

One Dupont Circle Association of
Suite 400 Governing Boards
Washington D.C. 20036 of Universities
202 296-8400 & Colleges

ACHIEVING INTEGRITY IN INTERCOLLEGIATE ATHLETICS

Wilford S. Bailey

The benefits of intercollegiate sports are widely recognized and generally accepted. They accrue to the participants, to spectators, and to the institutions in whose names the games are played. Indeed, sports generally are considered to provide a college or university with its best mechanism for bonding with alumni and friends of the institution.

Notwithstanding these positive features, there is a dark side of college sports as well--one that in recent years has exerted such a negative impact on the credibility of higher education that the need to control abuses in intercollegiate athletics is now a matter of crisis proportion. A recent national poll found that 75 percent of the public surveyed believe that intercollegiate athletics have gotten out of control; what is worse, 83 percent feel that the many serious rules violations in college sports have undermined universities as places where young people learn ethics and integrity. Given such perceptions, it is not surprising that reform has become a political issue, bringing on efforts at both national and state levels to impose changes from outside the academic community.

In this milieu, then, curtailing abuses in college sports is a high priority for higher education. Hence, the great emphasis on reform of college sports--both from within the academy and outside its walls.

To understand the current status of the sports reform movement and the direction it must take to be successful, one must comprehend the history of college sports in our nation as well as the relationship of American culture to this most visible aspect of higher education. These subjects, on which there is a growing volume of literature, cannot be addressed in any detail here. It is perhaps helpful to note that in much of the literature pervasive themes suggest that sports contests--perhaps especially the spectacular "big game"--may be read as cultural texts in which each spectator who witnesses in the game the individual player's attempt to create an integrity of purpose and movement is bound to other spectators in a sense of community as each strives for a comparable transformation.

The widening presence of television has expanded the fellowship of spectators, communicating concurrently with the visual presentation of the contest the democratic tendency to measure and record achievement, thus reinforcing elements implicit in the life of modern American society: organization, technological projection to consumer masses, and financial linkages with the corporate world of business, entertainment, and advertising. This widening presence of television has contributed to our society's addiction to entertainment, while at the same time evolving into a symbiotic relationship with athletics programs by providing some of the resources required to meet their spiraling costs driven by ever-increasing pressures to win.

The result in many athletics programs is the increasing emphasis on creative marketing and fund development and other manifestations of commercialism that contribute to expansion of the fissure between the two cultures--athletics and academe.

College sports in our nation began nearly 150 years ago with a crew race between Harvard and Yale on Lake Winnapausaukee in New Hampshire. For the next 50 years or so they were administered by students as extracurricular activities. Then, because of the concern by faculty and administrators about the lack of control over problems similar to those of today, college sports were incorporated into the structure of American higher education. It is important to note that only in the United States have athletics assumed such a close and representational identity with higher education.

Even though formally incorporated into the university structure nearly a century ago, intercollegiate sports have never escaped the charges, leveled at them almost from their beginning, that their self-fulfilling character, inherent professionalism, and primary purpose of entertainment have made their presence contradictory to the educational goals of the university. A strong case can be made for the argument that the abuses in college sports today are no different in nature than those of the past century, that they have only varied in magnitude and visibility as the contributing causes of the problems have changed.

The problems have, of course, not gone unnoticed; nor has there been an absence of criticism. Until recently, the most exhaustive and penetrating analysis of abuses in college sports was the 1929 report of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. The emerging signs of widespread anxiety about the corruption of college sports evident in that report seem to have been temporarily held off by the binding experiences of the Great Depression and World War II. However, as we address many of the same problems more than 60 years later, we must consider another possible reason for the failure of that early effort to resolve the relationship between athletics and academe: the inability of higher education to control the powerful cultural forces within which college sports had evolved, and are evolving still.

Additional efforts to effect reform since the 1929 Carnegie report also have not been successful. Consequently, in the 1990s we are confronting a widely prevalent, systemic problem. Data from the NCAA enforcement program, initiated in 1952, support this affirmation:

- During the 1980s, 54 of the 105 institutions in Division I-A of the NCAA (those with "big-time" football) were under public penalty at least once; and
- Slightly fewer than one-third of the institutions in Division I-A (each of which has had three or more public penalties imposed by the NCAA) account for approximately two-thirds of the total academic years of penalties experienced by the entire subdivision.

Although these data reflect abuses among the "big-time" sports programs that receive the greatest publicity--both in their entertainment appeal and in the sensational treatment of their abuses--it should be noted that abuses are not limited to these programs. In fact, there is considerable information to suggest that improprieties are as frequent, or nearly so, in the programs of institutions that do not provide athletics scholarships and that have no big-money gate receipts, bowl games, or television contracts.

The recent report of the Knight Foundation Commission on Intercollegiate Athletics notes the systemic nature of abuses in college sports and emphasizes the need for higher education to take major corrective actions.[1] A realistic solution to the problems in college sports "...will not be found without a serious and persistent commitment to a fundamental concept: intercollegiate athletics must reflect the values of the university."

The Kinght Commission proposes a "one-plus-three" model for the conduct of intercollegiate athletics programs. The "one" represents presidential control with the support and backing of trustees. Such control is meant to be directed toward the "three": academic integrity, financial integrity, and an independent audit and certification process.

[1]Free copies of the Commission's report, Keeping Faith With the Student-Athlete, are available by writing to the Knight Commission, 301 South Brevard St., Charlotte, N.C. 28202.

The commission's report culminates in a statement of ten principles summarizing the "one-plus-three" model and focusing on the well-being of the student-athletes who participate. The commission urges presidents and governing boards to use the statement of principles as a vehicle for serious discussions within their institutions. Numerous boards already have committed to these principles and have called for in-depth reviews of their athletics programs based upon the tenets laid out by the commission.

It is widely agreed that the current reform movement will lead to the development of a new model for college sports, as called for by NCAA Executive Director Richard Schultz. The concerted efforts of the NCAA Presidents Commission point toward this conclusion as well.

Before considering the status of this reform movement and the direction in which it needs to go in the years ahead, it is pertinent to ask, "Why has the effort to reform college sports been absent or ineffectual?" Answers to that question provide insights that can make current and future reform efforts more successful.

As in the case of all complex issues in our society, there is no simple accurate solution. We can, however, identify with confidence two major reasons for our failure to effectively control the problems of college sports: (1) Culturally, we have nurtured an insatiable appetite for sports and an addiction for entertainment that have fueled our tolerance for abuse, and (2) we have failed over the decades to address the fundamental causes of

abuses and have, instead, merely tinkered with secondary or contributing causes.

The cultural influences contributing to our present predicament have made us unable, or perhaps unwilling, to make the accurate diagnosis essential for effective control of this social illness. Consequently, our sense of anger and futility about the corruption of college sport may well be related to a suppressed awareness of our own complicity in sustaining and tolerating the condition. That condition, which today evokes such widespread concern, was characterized well by a president of a major university:

> *I think that we just basically are saying that there's one thing in America important enough to set up separate rules for--the only thing important enough to society to really exempt you from many of the requirements of the university, and that's athletics. They (the athletes) accept it, don't challenge it, and carry that perception away with them into later life.* [2]

The power of cultural influence, and its effect, paint a bleak picture. However, the situation is not as dark as this painting may lead one to believe. The prevalence of a disease--and the abuses in college sports can accurately be characterized as a serious disease of higher education--can be quite high while much of the population maintains good health. Effective control of most diseases merely awaits aggressive implementation of well-

[2]This and other quotations from university presidents are from the book ATHLETICS AND ACADEME: An Anatomy of Abuses and a Prescription for Reform.

established or specifically developed measures. The energy now being devoted to halting further separation between athletics and higher education, though not yet fully focused, suggests that the development of the right medicine may be at hand. We need to continue to examine and encourage the reform movement and its direction. Furthermore, we should have confidence in the ability of higher education and of society to achieve this goal.

Over the years many efforts have been made, and actions taken, to control abuses in college sports. (A striking example is the initiation in 1952 of the NCAA enforcement program.) In this short presentation it is not possible to identify all such efforts. Moreover, with respect to the current challenges, the focus must be on the most recent changes and the dynamic status of reform to which these have brought us.

The 1980s saw several major changes, signaling a wider interest in, and commitment to, strengthening the bond between athletics and academe. Among the more important and visible of these were the following:

- 1983 Adoption by the NCAA of more meaningful academic requirements for freshman eligibility (commonly known as Proposition 48) and continuing eligibility;
- 1984 Establishment of the NCAA Presidents Commission; and
- 1985 Revision of NCAA legislation imposing more severe penalties on institutions for major violations and placing greater emphasis on the role of the

chief executive officer in the control of athletics programs.

In the late 1980s, a number of other changes, some of them quite subtle and others very apparent, showed that the environment for reform was more favorable. NCAA Executive Director Richard Schultz signaled that the time was ripe for change at the association's 1990 convention when he challenged the membership to develop a "new model" for intercollegiate athletics that would demonstrate to the academic community and to the public that college sports can be effectively controlled.

Under the leadership of the Presidents Commission, the membership is responding to Schultz's challenge. It must be emphasized, however, that meaningful reform of college sports cannot be achieved overnight! In view of the complexity of the problems, the relationship of sports to our national culture, and our persistent failure to address fundamental causes, real reform will require a sustained commitment over several years of patient, dedicated effort.

It is easy to criticize the NCAA, the 800-member governing body for intercollegiate athletics, for its failure to more effectively control college sports. Some criticism is indeed justified. But it must be remembered that these institutions constitute the NCAA; they adopt all of its rules and regulations; and they approve all the procedures and policies for the enforcement program--the most visible and harshly criticized

component. There is no question but that over the years the membership has been more concerned with trying to create a "level playing field" than it has with its formally declared purpose--the wholeness of athletics and education. A strong case can be made, however, that the NCAA membership has now made a firm commitment to examine itself more intensively and to achieve meaningful reform.

Reform will be achieved more quickly and will be more effective if the membership accomplishes it from within than if it is implemented in response to mandates by government agencies at the national or state levels.

As emphasized by the Knight Commission in its recent report, if the NCAA did not exist, "...higher education would have to create it, or something very much like it. It is clear that a governing, rulemaking and disciplinary body of some sort is required....major change has to grow from within and mature through governing bodies. Handcuffing the NCAA is no way to advance athletics reform."

"Handcuffing the NCAA" is an appropriate description of what has begun to occur as the result of recent actions in several states--and pending or proposed actions in others--to require the NCAA to provide "due process" in order for its enforcement program to be fair. Although these state laws vary, all would require the NCAA to provide due process of the type found in courtrooms or other governmental adjudicatory institutions that have the power to use court procedures such as subpoenas, rules of evidence, and

appropriate punishment of reluctant witnesses for contempt of court. The NCAA has none of these powers.

It is somewhat ironic that this flurry of state activity follows so soon after the 1988 Supreme Court decision in NCAA v. Tarkanian that the NCAA is not a state actor or arm of the government but, rather, is a private entity not subject to the Due Process Clause of the 14th Amendment. Such activity should come as no surprise, however, when one considers the preception about fairness of the NCAA enforcement process traditionally held by ardent fans of an institution receiving major penalties for rules violations and the increasing political activism of our contemporary society. Not only have such fans generally felt that their institution had been penalized too severely, but there have been frequent charges that the NCAA has engaged in selective enforcement. Under such circumstances, gaining political support for restricting the NCAA's enforcement procedures in a given state is not too difficult to secure.

Rather than pursue here the motivation of politicians, it is more productive to emphasize that the NCAA has been responsive in its enforcement and infractions process to the standards of fair hearings established by the Supreme Court. Of the 10 procedural ingredients identified in Goldberg v. Kelly (1970), the NCAA traditionally has provided at least seven. One of the three remaining ingredients (cross-examination of adverse witnesses) is simply beyond the NCAA's power to ensure since, as a private

association, it lacks subpoena power. Thus, even under Goldberg's demanding standards, the NCAA hearing process arguably failed to meet only two ingredients (adequacy of notice and statement of reason). Certainly the NCAA process would meet the standards implicit in Mathews v. Eldridge (1976), in which the court recognized that it must balance government and private interests before deciding whether a particular government program satisfied due-process standards. (Report and Recommendations of the Special Committee to Review The NCAA Enforcement and Infractions Process, Oct. 28, 1991.)

As is true for any regulatory function that provides for punitive action, the enforcement process has had its flaws, although the NCAA membership generally has considered it to be fair. To eliminate as many flaws as possible, to enhance the perception of fairness of the process, and thus, to elicit more widespread support of the program by both the membership and the public, an intensive study of the enforcement process is being conducted by a committee of distinguished individuals with some of the best legal minds in the nation. Among the major recommendations in that committee's preliminary report are:

- Establish a "summary disposition" procedure for treating major violations at a reasonably early stage in the investigation;
- Liberalize the use of tape recordings and their availability to involved parties;
- Use former judges or other eminent legal authorities

as hearing officers in cases involving major violations not resolved in the "summary disposition" process;

- Open hearings to the greatest extent possible;
- Provide transcripts of all infractions hearings to appropriate involved parties;
- Refine and enhance the role of the Committee on Infractions and establish a limited appellate process beyond that committee; and
- Study the structure and procedures of the enforcement staff.

After public hearings, this report will be finalized, and the Committee on Infractions and the Presidents Council could adopt most of the proposed changes at the NCAA convention in January 1992. However, the provision to open hearings and to involve a judge in the process would require a vote of the entire NCAA membership; this most likely would occur at the 1993 convention but could be addressed at a special convention called for that purpose. These changes will strengthen support of the NCAA membership for the enforcement program and should allay the public's concerns about fairness. If higher education leaders make such a clear statement at the January NCAA meeting, state legislatures should curtail actions that make it difficult, if not impossible, for the NCAA to apply fairly in all states an enforcement program mandated by its membership to help control abuses in college sports.

A point must be made with respect to the work of this committee and the actions that will flow from it: This project is striking evidence of the ability and commitment of the NCAA to achieve reform by effective and efficient internal actions.

While the issues being addressed by proposed federal legislation are quite different and much more diverse than those in state initiatives, such legislation is unnecessary and would greatly complicate the reform efforts that have achieved sufficient momentum to warrant optimism. The higher education community should continue to have the opportunity to address its problems before the federal government intervenes further.

Two widely publicized bills before the House of Representatives serve as examples of the efforts of Congress to intervene by mandating elements of reform:

- The McMillen omnibus bill (H.R. 3046) would create an antitrust exemption for NCAA marketing of members' television rights, mandate distribution of television revenues (including those for in-season games) in accordance with statutorily defined educational or social criteria, and require that the NCAA be administered by a 33-member board of institutional chief executive officers.
- The Henry bill (H.R. 2433) would require institutions awarding athletically related financial aid to disclose

annually, on a per-sport basis, revenues and expenses of the intercollegiate athletics program.

The argument against government intervention is supported strongly by the fact that there are several signs of accelerating momentum and increasing commitment to the reform effort generated by the NCAA membership:

- The overwhelming success of the Presidents Commission in securing adoption by strong majority vote at the 1991 convention of its reform package, which included legislation to help achieve cost containment, reduction of athletics pressures on student-athletes and NCAA restructuring.
- Implementation by the Presidents Commission of a strategic-planning process that will identify, at least three years in advance, the principal issues to be addressed to achieve further reform. This planning will allow more time for the necessary intensive study and development of proposed legislation on these issues. Further, the strategic plan also includes monitoring the effectiveness of reform legislation after its implementation.
- Intensive effort on the part of the Presidents Commission to provide opportunity for various constituencies to have their interests communicated both to the commission and to the NCAA Council as proposed legislation is being developed and considered. This is very important as chief executive

officers fulfill their leadership responsibilities for reform and for securing consensus for it at the institutional and national levels.

- Strong agreement between the Presidents Commission and the Knight Commission on Intercollegiate Athletics about the objectives for reform and the general requirements and processes for achieving it.
- Increasing cooperation between the NCAA and national education associations to promote reform of college sports as an important part of improving higher education so that it can meet its challenges in preparing our nation to move into the 21st century.

Of critical importance in maintaining this momentum will be the adoption at the 1992 NCAA convention of the Presidents Commission's proposals to strengthen academic requirements for freshman and for continuing eligibility. For freshman eligibility (effective in 1995), the number of required core courses would be increased from 11 to 13 and the minimum grade point average on the core courses from 2.0 to 2.5. Analysis of NCAA data on academic performance of student-athletes shows that this would increase the percentage of student-athletes graduating in five years. The continuing-eligibility requirements would ensure that the student-athlete is making adequate progress in number of courses in his or her declared major and in grade-point average to be able to graduate in five years.

While considerable progress has been made, and we can be far more optimistic now than five years ago about achieving meaningful reform of college sports, the outcome is by no means certain. Consequently, it is imperative that higher education leaders gain consensus on the major issues and on the steps to take to reach short-term and long-term goals.

The report of the Knight Commission, which has been widely publicized and generally supported, provides guidance in this respect. As emphasized in the report, college sports can be controlled only at the institutional level. For this to occur, the president must have ultimate responsibility and final authority for the conduct of the intercollegiate athletics program.

For trustees to explicitly endorse and reaffirm presidential authority in all matters of athletics governance, the Knight Commission recommends that governing boards do the following:

- Delegate to the president administrative authority over financial matters in the athletics program.
- Work with the president to develop common principles for hiring, evaluating, and terminating all athletics administrators, and affirm the president's role and ultimate authority in this central aspect of university administration.
- Advise each new president of the board's expectations about athletics administration and annually review the athletics program.

- Work with the president to define the faculty's role, which should be focused on academic issues in athletics.

The essence of these points addressed by the Knight Commission has been enunciated and strongly endorsed by the NCAA Presidents Commission in a handbook on intercollegiate athletics prepared for chief executive officers:

> ". . .the CEO must have the unwavering support of the institution's governing board. That governing board should assist in determining the appropriate role of athletics in the institution's mission, but it should delegate full control and administration of the athletics department to the CEO and should support the CEO unequivocally during periods when controversial decisions are unavoidable. (The Chief Executive Officer and Intercollegiate Athletics: A Handbook; NCAA, in press.)

Governing board members should study carefully the informative AGB Special Report by L. Jay Oliva, What Trustees Should Know About Intercollegiate Athletics. Of particular significance for governing board members are these two points articulated by Oliva:

- "... a controlled athletic program that reflects your institution's values can be one of the finest vehicles for communicating strength."
- "The responsibility for intercollegiate athletics is squarely in the hands of your president and provost. If it is not there, put it there; if they don't accept it now, make sure they do."

In addition, AGB members should be aware of a resolution, adopted in 1989 by the board of directors, that endorses

presidential control. (The resolution is available by writing to AGB.)

It is not only the relationship of the CEO and the governing board that is of utmost importance in the effective control of abuses of college sports. Because one of the fundamental causes of these abuses is disregard for education as the central mission of the university, the faculty--whose quintessential responsibility is to ensure the integrity of the institution's academic program--must play an active role. Clearly there should be continuing and open communication between the CEO and faculty leadership about the athletics program. Furthermore, the faculty (usually by appropriate representation through the faculty senate) should have a voice in the development and revision of the institution's position document on athletics. Moreover, at least once each academic year the faculty senate should receive a report on the academic aspects of the athletics program.

Several reasons exist for the lack of enthusiasm on the part of the faculty to be a major participant in the governance of intercollegiate athletics. These include the loose structure of decision making in higher education, the higher priority faculty place on their primary roles of teaching and research, and a natural inclination not to join with the administration in such activities. However, this responsibility can no longer be shirked. In recent years, faculty committees at several major institutions have undertaken extensive reviews of their athletics departments in an effort to achieve the required wholeness in the relationship of

athletics and academe. Faculty recommendations frequently concern authority over special admissions for athletes and access to information about the academic progress of student-athletes.

The aforementioned efforts by the Presidents Commission to have legislation adopted at the 1992 NCAA convention for stronger academic requirements for freshman and for continuing eligibility are important steps in the reform process. It must be emphasized, however, that the NCAA can be expected to set only minimal standards to help prevent erosion of academic credibility of higher education and to help its respective divisions maintain a reasonably level playing field. In the final analysis, it is the responsibility of each institution, possibly with assistance from its conference, to ensure its own academic credibility by admitting only those student-athletes who have a reasonable chance of academic success in that institution. To do otherwise clearly reflects a lack of institutional integrity.

The focus of the Presidents Commission strategic plan for the 1993 convention is institutional responsibility and presidential authority. Included in these crucial issues is the matter of certification of an institution's athletics program. The NCAA currently is conducting a pilot certification program (in which more than 30 Division I institutions, located in all regions of the country, are participating) to identify the essential features of a mandatory program to be voted on by the membership at the 1993 convention. It is anticipated that certification will be required

at five-year intervals and that the standards will address the adequacy of an institution's organizational structure and procedures to ensure compliance with NCAA legislation and those principles set forth in the Knight Commission's report.

As work moves forward to prepare for the mandatory certification program, the NCAA and regional accrediting agencies should cooperate to determine the appropriate relationship between NCAA certification and regional academic accreditation. Mutual agreement on the adequacy and effectiveness of athletics certification relative to its impact on the academic credibility of an institution is necessary, as is cooperation to avoid unnecessary duplication of effort.

For the 1994 and 1995 conventions, the focus will be on financial conditions and issues and the welfare of the student-athlete, respectively. These topics are consistent with the major areas of emphasis in the Knight Commission report.

Thus far, this overview of athletics reform has focused primarily on issues related to only one of the two fundamental causes of abuses in college sports: disregard for education as the mission of the university. While intimately interwoven with these issues, the other fundamental cause is sufficiently discrete also to warrant major emphasis: the disregard for basic ethical values.

Given the universally recognized fact that morality cannot be legislated, this cause of abuse will not be eliminated by changes

in NCAA legislation. Rather, if meaningful reform of college sports is to be achieved, ethical values must be addressed directly. The following observation by a university president commenting on the current state of intercollegiate athletics provides a perceptive insight on the current state of ethical conduct in college sports:

> *Let me tell you this: every university president has to contend with the tendency of the institution to live a life comparable to that of the society it's a part of.*
>
> *But the point is, it shouldn't be that way. I mean the university should always be the book by which we pull the standard up, not respond to it. What we've seen, for example, in this deteriorating relationship between athletics and the institution itself in terms of academic and behavioral standards is probably the most visible reflection of what has to be described as a serious ailment.*

Widely publicized scandals in government and business suggest that our society has lost touch with fundamental values and standards of ethical behavior. An indication of the importance assigned to this issue is the identification of "...restoring respect for fundamental values and ethical behavior" as one of the five most important challenges that will preoccupy the American people in the 1990s and into the next century (Memorandum to the 41st President of the United States From the Commission on National Challenges in Higher Education, American Council on Education, January 1988).

In response to this challenge, an increasing number of institutions are initiating formal and informal programs to assist undergraduates in evaluating the values by which they live. Derek

Bok, president emeritus of Harvard University, has been perhaps the foremost spokesperson in higher education in urging colleges and universities to "...offer arguments and encouragement of various kinds to persuade students to adhere to certain basic norms...honesty, nonviolence, promise-keeping, respect for property and other legitimate interests." He makes a convincing case in Universities and the Future of America that these basic norms, and others such as free expression and helping others, are "...not only principles essential to civilized society; they are values on which all learning and discovery depend."

Acknowledging that some effort is being made on most campuses to help students acquire a stronger sense of moral and civic responsibility and that a number of graduate and professional programs have begun to offer formal courses in applied ethics, Bok expresses disappointment that, "...especially in large universities, the subject is still not treated as a serious responsibility worthy of sustained discussion and determined action by the faculty and administration." This is particularly true in intercollegiate athletics where, given the systemic nature of abuses, the need to educate is great.

It is obvious that efforts of the type Bok proposes should be promoted to help all college students develop proper values. However, recent research suggests that college athletes, in particular, have been placed in a unique position during their moral development, in that participation in a sport involves a

moral transformation in which egocentricity is redefined as appropriate. Limited research in this area found that male college basketball playershad significantly lower maturity of moral reasoning than their nonathlete counterparts. Therefore, student-athletes, as a subgroup of college students, pose an interesting and important challenge in the instruction of moral development, reasoning, and behavior. Efforts in this area perhaps should be directed, first of all, to coaches and other athletics personnel because of their great influence on student-athletes. An appropriate way to reach these groups would be through well-designed professional improvement programs developed by conferences for their member institutions.

The issue of ethical conduct on the part of all involved in college sports leads to what may be the greatest challenge to the reform movement: changing societal attitudes about the proper role of intercollegiate athletics in higher education. To achieve the proper balance of athletics and academics in higher education, our society must be far more devoted to education than to entertainment. The average spectator must be more concerned about grade-point averages than field-goal shooting percentages, and the sheepskin must be a more coveted trophy than the pigskin. Only then will American culture's addiction to entertainment have been modified significantly to overcome its tolerance for abuse and its shameless acceptance of unethical behavior.

The complexity and enormity of the problems surrounding intercollegiate athletics make it abundantly clear that at both the institutional and national levels the chief executive officers of our colleges and universities must be in control. Furthermore, presidents must have the support of all constituencies if higher education is to fulfill its responsibilities in preparing our nation for leadership in the 21st century.

If true wholeness of athletics and academe cannot be achieved and college sports cannot be operated with integrity in this decade, the only alternative may well be amputation of intercollegiate athletics from the academy. That would be a tragic loss for us all.

NOTES

Detailed references seem inappropriate for this paper, so I am unable to give proper recognition to many on whose work I have drawn. To all I am grateful, and express my thanks in this way. Several sources are referenced in the text because of their importance, and their full references are given below.

Much of the substance of this paper is drawn from the book Athletics and Academe: An Anatomy of Abuses and a Prescription for Reform, in which many relevant references will be found on such subjects as the history of college sports in America and the relationship of our national culture to intercollegiate athletics and their abuses. The book discusses more extensively the use of the medical metaphor of abuses in college sports as a disease of higher education and the value of this metaphor in helping the reader to understand the necessity for both accuracy of diagnosis and addressing fundamental causes in the effective control of a disease.

Even though it is not possible to identify all to whom I am indebted, I would be remiss in not expressing special thanks to two: Taylor D. Littleton, coauthor of Athletics and Academe, and James Whalen, president of Ithaca College, whose description of American culture's addiction to entertainment, and its consequences, I paraphrase.

REFERENCES

1. Athletics and Academe: An Anatomy of Abuses and a Prescription for Reform, Wilford S. Bailey and Taylor D. Littleton, American Council on Education and Macmillan Publishing Co., New York, 1991.

2. Keeping Faith With the Student-Athlete: A New Model for Intercollegiate Athletics, Report of the Knight Foundation Commission on Intercollegiate Athletics, Charlotte, N.C., March, 1991.

3. Memorandum to the 41st President of the United States From the Commission on National Challenges in Higher Education, American Council on Education, Washington, D.C., January, 1988.

4. Report and Recommendations of the Special Committee to Review the NCAA Enforcement and Infractions Process, NCAA, October 28, 1991.

5. The Chief Executive Officer and Intercollegiate Athletics: A Handbook, NCAA, In press.

6. Universities and the Future of America, Derek Bok, Duke University Press, Durham, N.C., 1990.

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

Wil Bailey is a professor and president emeritus of Auburn University where he has held a continuous faculty appointment for 49 years. He has held positions of distinction in a number of honor and professional societies, including the presidency of both the American Society of Parasitologists and the American Society of Tropical Medicine and Hygiene. He has conducted research and traveled extensively in Third World countries.

Bailey's experience in intercollegiate athletics includes ten years as Faculty Athletics Representative at Auburn; eight years as secretary of the Southeastern Conference, including representing the SEC for two years on the NCAA Council; and two years as secretary-treasurer and two years as president of the NCAA. With his colleague, Taylor Littleton, he wrote the book Athletics and Academe: An Anatomy of Abuses and a Prescription for Reform, published by the American Council on Education and Macmillan Publishing Co. in January 1991.

Bailey holds a D.V.M. degree and a M.S. degree for Auburn University and a Sc.D. degree from The Johns Hopkins University. Now retired, Bailey serves as a consultant for the NCAA Presidents Commission and holds a part-time appointment at Auburn.